

**HANFORD REACH NATIONAL MONUMENT
FEDERAL PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Final Meeting Summary: Session # 9
Wednesday, October 16, 2002
Red Lion Hotel, Columbia Room
Richland, WA**

The Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, October 16, 2002 from 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the Red Lion Hotel, Columbia Room in Richland, Washington.

The purpose of the meeting was to:

1. Hear reports on what was discussed during reviews of Monument resources: wildlife and habitat, cultural resources, geological and paleontological resources, and public use and visitor services; and
2. Hear a report on public scoping from the planning team.

Welcome and Introductions

Greg Hughes, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Designated Federal Official (DFO) and Project Leader, Hanford Reach National Monument, opened the meeting and welcomed Committee members, the public, and other attendees. Mr. Hughes turned the meeting over to the Committee Chair, Jim Watts.

Mr. Watts reviewed the public comment process and reminded those making public comment that there was a five-minute time limit. A public comment sheet was available at the sign in table for those interested in giving comment. He also reviewed the Committee's purpose and charter.

Alice Shorett, facilitator, reviewed the day's agenda, noting that the purpose of the day's session was to hear reports on resource reviews conducted on the Monument during the summer, and to hear a planning update on public scoping from the planning team. She reviewed the Committee time line as previously referenced in Committee meetings, with specific detail on where the Committee is to date regarding public scoping, and where the current Committee charter ends (see Attachment A).

Meeting Minutes from Session #8

Jim Watts asked the Committee if there were any changes to the meeting summary from session #8 on August 14, 2002. There were no changes suggested. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the summary as is.

Action: Committee moved and seconded to adopt the meeting summary #8 as is.

Report on what was found in review of Monument resources

Jim Watts welcomed guest speakers from the USFWS that would be presenting information on each of the resource reviews that took place over the summer. He gave a brief background of the purpose of the reviews, and what reviews were done: wildlife and habitat, visitor services and public use, geological/paleontological, and cultural resources. He then introduced Glenn Frederick explaining he would give the Committee more detail on the reviews and how they fit into the overall planning process.

Mr. Frederick spoke briefly on the context of reviews done during the planning process outside of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP). He noted that scoping identifies potential issues and management concerns, in relation to current practices. The reviews bring together internal and external experts in the relative field to discuss current issues in the field. Together, the information will be sifted through and will ultimately help the USFWS identify the issues, opportunities and concerns that lead to specific purposes, goals and possible alternatives for action. Mr. Frederick then turned the floor over to the individual resource review presenters.

Wildlife and Habitat

Fred Paveglio, Regional Refuge Biologist, USFWS, addressed the Committee regarding the wildlife and habitat review that took place in June. He described why the USFWS does the reviews with respect to their mandate and mission. The purposes used for this review were taken directly from the Presidential Proclamation. After presenting background information on the review, Mr. Paveglio spoke to some of the issues discussed among the participants at the review. Some of the topics were fire breaks, elk management, public use in the White Bluffs, wetland re-establishment near Ringold, the WB-10 ponds and Saddle Mountain lakes. There were a variety of other topics discussed. See Attachment B for Mr. Paveglio's presentation.

Q: Will the report include the names of those who attended?

R: Mr. Paveglio affirmed that it would.

Q: Did you find inconsistencies between historical wetlands and current use?

R: Historic wetland use occurred over by Ringold hatchery. There is currently a break in the levee that historically kept the wetland saturated. There are opportunities for restoration in that area to return to natural wetland composition.

Q: What is the role of the USFWS in the Priest Rapids Dam re-licensing, and the Vernita Bar Agreement?

R: Mr. Paveglio responded by saying that the USFWS has dealt with Federal Energy

Regulatory Commission (FERC) permitting previously through the Ecological Services Unit and that there are opportunities to get thoughts together specific to Priest Rapids Dam. The USFWS has an official capacity for participation and the Monument can offer advice during the process.

Q: Is there documentation for the scientific judgements made?

R: Mr. Paveglio's response was to clarify that if the question relates to peer-review of the discussion, then no that will not happen. The USFWS invited experts to participate in the reviews, and held discussion on each topic in the field during the review. Those discussions are the essence of the resource review report.

There was some additional discussion regarding the FERC re-licensing of the Priest Rapids Dam. Nancy Craig, irrigation/utilities seat on the Committee, expounded on the Vernita Bar Agreement clarifying that there are 7-12 parties involved, and that they operate in a coordinated fashion on the entire system upriver from Priest Rapids. It is very difficult to focus solely on Priest Rapids due to the number of parties involved. Additionally, Grant County PUD would welcome the opportunity to provide information to the USFWS on the FERC re-licensing, and Columbia River operations.

Cultural Resources

Jenna Gaston, Cultural Resource Specialist, USFWS, presented information regarding the cultural resource review that took place in April. The purpose of this review was to help identify data gaps in the existing record. The participants discussed cultural resources, including Native American uses, Euro-American uses and atomic era structures on or near the Monument. Some of the issues the group specifically addressed were (a) preservation and protection of the cultural resources including native habitat restoration, and Native American and public use of the Monument; (b) local watch establishment to protect the cultural resources; and (c) connectivity between people and the cultural resources over time valuable for interpretation of cultural heritage. See Attachment C for the presentation.

Q: Will there be any planning for the Cold War era?

R: Yes, the report will address this, as will the CCP.

Q: Mr. Paveglio spoke to cultural and treaty rights except for pasturing. How is the past going to meet the present with respect to management planning on this issue?

R: Ms. Gaston responded by saying that there is significant work progressing on restoring trust with Native Americans and their treaty rights. Grazing was specifically left out of the Proclamation due to protection of the shrub-steppe habitat.

Geological/Paleontological Resources

Ms. Gaston again presented information relative to the geological and paleontological resource

review that took place in August. The review participants discussed the geological formations within the Monument and the paleontological remains currently known. The group spent a significant amount of time discussing the formation of the White Bluffs, and some specific issues associated with sloughing of the Bluffs. They have found 27 mammals alone in White Bluffs deposits. She explained there are certain archaeological issues associated with erosion along river islands and the White Bluffs, mostly where artifacts are or could be lost. See Attachment C for her presentation.

Visitor Services and Public Use

Jean Harrison, Regional Chief of Visitor Services, USFWS, addressed the Committee regarding visitor services and public use on the Monument. The review took place in July. She gave a contextual background similar to that of Mr. Paveglio's stating reasons for the review and from where they defined their purpose. Some specific issues the review participants addressed included the types of visitors to the Monument, ways of accessing the Monument, types of jurisdiction, camping needs on and off the Monument, hunting and fishing programs, White Bluffs sloughing and public safety, law enforcement, horseback riding, wildlife observation, environmental education, volunteer programs, visitors center, interpretation and potential partnerships. See Attachment D for Ms. Harrison's presentation.

- Q: How do we blend cultural and habitat topics for an interpretive center? How as a group do you recommend we get an interpretive center in the USFWS budget?
- R: Ms. Harrison responded by saying that Congress has looked at the department's history with visitors centers, and it has not been positive. They are concerned about the dollars spent on visitor centers with respect to the visitor usage. Several years ago Congress asked the Department of the Interior for a priority list of visitor centers across the nation. The USFWS presented a list of their top 20 visitor centers; this region (Region 1) has three centers in that top twenty list. Currently, there is a cap of \$3M to build a visitor center, although there are exceptions, such as when administrative facilities are also included. Included in that \$3M cap are: A&E design costs, site and building infrastructure work, construction and construction contingency costs, parking, landscaping, exhibit design and fabrication costs, AND furniture, computers, etc. There is currently no cap on the administrative facility although the size of the building and number of offices must be developed using the RONS Tier 1 approved minimum staffing levels.

There was a suggestion that with the Lewis and Clark bicentennial celebration coming next year, the USFWS could take a look at their priorities with Congress and get a Monument visitors center prioritized. Another comment was made that from a fish and wildlife perspective, it makes most sense to get out in the environment to see and witness it, while from a Monument perspective, a visitor/interpretive center is very important.

Introduction of Planning Team. Report on public scoping: Discussion and comments from the Committee. What did we hear? What happens next?

Greg Hughes thanked and applauded all those that spent a significant amount of time working to pull the resource review information together. He then introduced the CCP Planning Team to the Committee:

- Dan Haas, Lead Planner
- Glenn Frederick, Co-Lead Planner
- Jenna Gaston, Cultural Resources Specialist
- Dave Smith, Natural Resources Specialist
- Heidi Newsome, Biologist
- Paula Call, Outdoor Recreation Specialist
- Tom Ferns, DOE Representative and NEPA Specialist

Mr. Hughes also thanked colleagues from the Regional Office: Don Voros, Chuck Houghten and Mike Marxen. The Regional Office has lent a lot of support during the planning process and continues to support the Monument. He then asked Mr. Haas to present to the Committee information on public scoping, the planning process time line and next steps.

Mr. Haas started by discussing the four public scoping meetings held during the summer in Mattawa, Seattle, Richland and Yakima. He discussed the overall attendance and format for each of the meetings. He also thanked the Committee for their participation at each of the meetings. In general, comments at meetings focused mostly on public use and access, and wildlife and habitat. At the time of the meeting, there were 122 written comments received from letters, Planning Workbooks and e-mail. Mr. Haas explained four important next steps: (1) Triangle Associates will produce a Scoping Report to be e-mailed to the Committee in November; (2) the Committee will receive the four resource reviews reports; (3) a Draft Vision and Goals Workshop has been organized for the first week in November, which many Committee members have been invited to attend; and (4) the Committee will review the Draft Vision and Goals product from the Workshop, and provide advice to the USFWS and DOE on the Draft.

There was some discussion among the Committee regarding the time commitment for the Workshop. It is organized for mandatory attendance for three and one-half days during the first week in November. Committee members also expressed some concern regarding the timing of the Workshop, and how the products relate both to the Committee and the CCP. Mr. Haas clarified that the Workshop will be facilitated, and are structured in a way to keep the planning process on track for production of Draft Vision and Goals for the Monument in a timely manner.

Q: Will you still take scoping comments?

R: Mr. Haas responded by saying the scoping period ended on October 12th, but they are still taking comments, and will continue to do so throughout the planning process.

- Q: Will the Workshop goals, strategies and vision be brought back to this Committee? Also, will these be available for public review?
- R: Mr. Haas affirmed that the Committee will review the draft product that comes out of the Workshop. The Committee will ultimately provide advice to the USFWS and DOE on the Draft Vision and Goals. This means the Committee will review the draft prior to the next meeting. Also, once the Committee has given advice to the USFWS and DOE, the Draft Vision and Goals Statement will become part of the CCP process.

Recap and Next Steps

Greg Hughes briefed the Committee on the process for filling vacancies and re-chartering the Committee. He stated that the USFWS sent a package to the Secretary of the Interior to fill vacancies in May, but they still have not received word. A package to re-charter the Committee was sent to the Regional Office last week, and will be forwarded to the Secretary's Office after that. He mentioned that he is being optimistic that the re-charter will occur prior to the current charter expiration on January 11, 2003.

Ms. Shorett proposed the Committee have two more session prior to the expiration of the current charter in January, whether or not the Committee is re-chartered. This will give the Committee the opportunity to provide advice to the USFWS and DOE twice more before then, on the Draft Vision and Goals, scoping and resource reviews. She proposed the Committee move their scheduled meeting for Tuesday, November 19th to Tuesday, December 3rd. She also proposed the Committee schedule a meeting for Tuesday, January 7th. The Committee agreed to these dates.

Action: The Committee moved the November 19th meeting to Tuesday, December 3rd. They also scheduled a meeting for Tuesday, January 7th. Both will take place at the WSU-CIC rooms 120 and 120A.

Public Comment

Del Ballard, B-Reactor Museum Association, addressed the Committee. He said he understands this Committee sent a letter to the DOE expressing their desire for the future of B-Reactor to be considered in the CCP. He also understands that the DOE has publicly stated that they are not in the museum business, and therefore have no dollars for preservation of B-Reactor, despite having museums at Oak Ridge and in Idaho. He stated the B-Reactor Museum Association continues to seek funding and partnerships for preservation of B-Reactor.

One concern he has is that all the rules and regulations for the USFWS seem to lead to restricted access. For a museum, they would desire just the opposite. They desire unfettered access to B-Reactor.

Mr. Watts responded to Mr. Ballard's comments stating that the Committee did send an official

letter to the USFWS and DOE that B-Reactor be considered in the CCP. Mr. Hughes added that the USFWS has asked the National Park Service to consider options for the B-Reactor as well.

Greg Hughes adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

Certified By:

Greg Hughes, DFO

Jim Watts, Chair

MEETING ATTENDANCE

| Committee Seat | Member | Alternate |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| K-12 Education | Karen Weida | Royace Aikin |
| Cities | | <i>vacant</i> |
| Conservation/Environmental | Rick Leaumont | Mike Lilga |
| Counties | | Frank Brock |
| Economic Development | Jim Watts | |
| Outdoor Recreation | | Mike Wiemers |
| Public-at-Large | Kris Watkins | |
| Scientific/Academic | Michele Gerber | Eric Gerber |
| | | Dennis Dauble |
| | Gene Schreckhise | Ed Rykiel |
| State | Jeff Tayer | Ron Skinnarland |
| Tribal | Rex Buck | <i>vacant</i> |
| Utilities/Irrigation | Nancy Craig | <i>vacant</i> |
| Designated Federal Official | Greg Hughes | |

Participants and Invited Speakers

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| U.S. Department of Energy | Steve Wisness |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Glenn Frederick |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Fred Pavaglio |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Jean Harrison |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Jenna Gaston |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Dan Haas |

Facilitators

| | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Triangle Associates, Inc. | Alice Shorett | Derek Van Marter |
|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|

Meeting Support

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| U.S. Department of Energy | Jill Spargur |
|---------------------------|--------------|

Observers

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Paula Call |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Don Voros |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Chuck Houghten |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Dave Smith |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Mike Marxen |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Naomi Sherer |
| U.S. Department of Energy | Dana Ward |
| U.S. Department of Energy | Tom Ferns |

*Hanford Reach National Monument
Federal Planning Advisory Committee
Meeting Summary*

Final
October 16, 2002

Environmental Protection Agency
Yakama Nation
BPA
BPA
BPA
Benton County
Backcountry Horsemen of WA
Backcountry Horsemen of WA
Richland Rod & Gun
Tri-City Herald
B-Reactor Museum Assoc.
Public

Larry Gadbois
Jay McConnaughley
Mary Hollen
Bill Erickson
Don Rose
Adam Fyall
Linda Smith
Sam Meacham
Eugene Van Liew
Mike Lee
Del Ballard
Dennis Fall
Bob Martin

DISTRIBUTED MATERIALS

Committee's Packet of Materials

Meeting Agenda (October 16, 2002)
Draft Meeting Summary: Session #8 (August 14, 2002)
Committee Timeline Chart
Public Scoping Meeting Flip Charts
Public Scoping Summary Slides
October Update on the Assessment of the White Bluffs Landslide
Letter from Keith Klein, DOE-RL (B Reactor response)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Progress Since August 2002 FAC Meeting
Public Scoping Summary Slides
Agenda Hanford Reach National Monument Planning Workshop I (November 4-7, 2002)
First Workshop Confirmations